

Applicants continue to assert allowability of all non-elected claims 10-71 for purposes of a divisional, continuation, continuation-in-part application or otherwise.

Applicant does not traverse the Registration requirement.

No change to the inventorship is required.

REMARKS

Comments of the Examiner have been reviewed carefully along with pertinent sections of the Patent Act, Patent Rules, Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, legal treatises and relevant decisional law. It is believed that a full Election in response to the Restriction has been set forth hereinabove.

Restriction to one of the following inventions was required under 35 USC 121:

- I. Claims 1-9, drawn to a method of imaging an object using chroma-keying.
- II. Claims 18-25, drawn to a method for producing a retro-reflective material.
- III. Claims 26-71, drawn to a composition of a retro-reflective material.

Claims 10-17 had not been mentioned in the Restriction requirement. Applicant's United States Patent Attorney discussed to omission with the Examiner who indicated that Claims 10-17 should have been designated as another Species of the invention.

Applicant has elected Species I, Claims 1-9, drawn to a method of imaging an object using chroma-keying. Allowability of all other claims continues to be maintained by Applicant's for purposes of a divisional, continuation, continuation-in-part Application or otherwise.

Applicant does not traverse the Restriction requirement.

The inventorship remains the same under 37 CFR 1.48(b).

Courtesy, cooperation and skill of Examiner HANNETT are acknowledged and appreciated.

Respectfully,



CHARLES E. BAXLEY
Attorney of Record
USPTO Reg 20,149
90 John Street, Third Floor
New York, NY 10038
Tel: (212) 791-7200
Fax: (212) 791-7276
E-Mail:ceb@hartbaxley.com

CEB:lp